

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 11-19 are pending in the application. Claims 2, 11, 15, and 16 are herein amended. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-8 were withdrawn from application. Claim 10 is herein cancelled. No new matter has been presented.

Examiner Interview

Applicant greatly appreciates the courtesy extended by the Examiners to Applicant's representative, Sadao Kinashi, in the personal interview conducted on July 19, 2011. The following remarks reflect explanation of the Applicant's representative during the interview.

Applicant's representative clarifies the comment in the interview summary "Mr. Kinashi explained that the purpose of Applicant's invention was to speed up the production of the resinous preform by extending the contact between the first and second path." It should be noted that speed up of the production of resin preform is an advantage of the present invention rather than the objective of the invention.

This Supplemental Amendment is submitted based on the Examiners' indications during the interview that "the phrase 'elastically conforms' may be both unclear in scope and may be new matter, and that the word "overlap in a plain view over a distance" does not distinguish over Saito et al.

Claim Amendment and Support

Claim 2 has been amended to recite, among other things, "making the holding mechanism vary a rotation radius or oscillate, such that a portion of the second path elastically conforms to the

first path and that the first path and the second path coincide in a plain view over a distance thereby making a following zone.”

The amendment is supported in the original disclosure. Original claims 9 and 12 recited substantially the same features. Also, the descriptions, for example, lines 2-6 on page 11, the last two lines of page 11 to line 2 of page 12, lines 4-7 on page 12, Fig. 6 (lines 2-13 on page 31), Fig. 7 (lines 8-22 on page 35) are sufficient support for a person of ordinary skill in the art.


Although the word “coincide” does not appear in the specification. The use of words, “overlap” and “follow,” in the specification, for example at pages 6-7 sufficiently supports “the first path and the second path coincide in a plain view over a distance” for a person of ordinary skill in the art.

Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 2, 5-6, 10 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (US 2002/0088767 A1).

As mentioned above, claim 2 has been amended to recite, among other things, “making the holding mechanism vary a rotation radius or oscillate such that a portion of the second path elastically conforms to the first path and that the first path and the second path coincide in a plain view over a distance thereby making a following zone.”

FIG.9



As shown in Fig. 9 of Saito et al., the path of the grip member 23 and the path of the molding die are in merely tangential relation. The holding mechanism does not vary a rotation radius or oscillate such that a portion of the second path elastically conforms to the first path. Also, the first path and the second path do not coincide in a plain view over a distance.

Saito et al. does not teach or suggest “making the holding mechanism vary a rotation radius or oscillate such that a portion of the second path elastically conforms to the first path and that the first path and the second path coincide in a plain view over a distance thereby making a following zone.” and “wherein the holding mechanism supplies the drop into the molding die in a follow-up manner.”

For at least these reasons, claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Saito et al. Claims 5, 6, and 19, depending from claim 2, also patentably distinguish over Saito et al. for at least the same reasons. Claim 10 is cancelled making the rejection of the claim moot.

Rejections under 35 USC §103(a)

Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Winter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,152,723), henceforth Winter.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Winter as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Suzuki et al. (U.S. Patent 4,312,437), henceforth Suzuki.

Claim 13/11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Winter as applied to claim 11 above, and further in view of Choinski (US 2002/0093126 A1).

Claim 13/12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Winter and Suzuki as applied to claim 12 above, and further in view of Choinski.

Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Vogel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,514,448 B1), henceforth Vogel.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Vogel as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Zoppas (U.S. Patent No. 6,422,379 B1).

Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito in view of Vogel as applied to claim 14 above, and further in view of Winter and Choinski.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Saito as applied to claim 2 above.

Claim 9 has already been cancelled. Claims 11-16 and 18 directly or indirectly depend from claim 2. The references, Ingram, Winter et al., Suzuki et al., Choinski, Vogel et al., and Zoppas are not cited for disclosing the “following zone” and they do not disclose the “following zone.” Thus, these references do not teach or suggest “making the holding mechanism vary a rotation radius or oscillate such that a portion of the second path elastically conforms to the first path and that the first

path and the second path coincide in a plain view over a distance thereby making a following zone.” and “wherein the holding mechanism supplies the drop into the molding die in a follow-up manner.”

Thus, these references do not remedy the deficiencies of Saito et al. discussed above.

For at least these reasons, claim 11-16 and 18 patentably distinguish over Saito, Ingram, Winter et al., Suzuki et al., Choinski, Vogel et al., and Zoppas.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.

If the Examiner believes that this application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to expedite the disposition of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

/Sadao Kinashi/

Sadao Kinashi
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 48,075
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

SK/kn